

<b>Notice of Allowability</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/708,154	OWEN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Michael B. Holmes	2121	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--**

All claims being allowable, PROSECUTION ON THE MERITS IS (OR REMAINS) CLOSED in this application. If not included herewith (or previously mailed), a Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85) or other appropriate communication will be mailed in due course. **THIS NOTICE OF ALLOWABILITY IS NOT A GRANT OF PATENT RIGHTS.** This application is subject to withdrawal from issue at the initiative of the Office or upon petition by the applicant. See 37 CFR 1.313 and MPEP 1308.

1. ☒ This communication is responsive to July 21, 2004.
2. ☒ The allowed claim(s) is/are 1-7,9-12,14,16-20,22-25 and 27.
3. ☐ The drawings filed on \_\_\_\_\_ are accepted by the Examiner.
4. ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some\*    c) ☐ None    of the:
    1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_.

Applicant has THREE MONTHS FROM THE "MAILING DATE" of this communication to file a reply complying with the requirements noted below. Failure to timely comply will result in ABANDONMENT of this application.

**THIS THREE-MONTH PERIOD IS NOT EXTENDABLE.**

5. ☐ A SUBSTITUTE OATH OR DECLARATION must be submitted. Note the attached EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT or NOTICE OF INFORMAL PATENT APPLICATION (PTO-152) which gives reason(s) why the oath or declaration is deficient.
  6. ☒ CORRECTED DRAWINGS ( as "replacement sheets") must be submitted.
    - (a) ☒ including changes required by the Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review ( PTO-948) attached
      - 1) ☐ hereto or 2) ☐ to Paper No./Mail Date July 03, 2003.
    - (b) ☐ including changes required by the attached Examiner's Amendment / Comment or in the Office action of Paper No./Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- Identifying indicia such as the application number (see 37 CFR 1.84(c)) should be written on the drawings in the front (not the back) of each sheet. Replacement sheet(s) should be labeled as such in the header according to 37 CFR 1.121(d).
7. ☐ DEPOSIT OF and/or INFORMATION about the deposit of BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL must be submitted. Note the attached Examiner's comment regarding REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEPOSIT OF BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) <sup>b</sup>                            | 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)            |
| 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                | 6. <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413),<br>Paper No./Mail Date _____. |
| 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statements (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08),<br>Paper No./Mail Date _____ | 7. <input type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Amendment/Comment                               |
| 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Comment Regarding Requirement for Deposit<br>of Biological Material          | 8. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance   |
|   | 9. <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____.   |



---

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 – [WWW.USPTO.GOV](http://www.USPTO.GOV)

**Examiner's Detailed Office Action**

1. Claims 1-7, 9-12, 14, 16-20, 22-25, & 27 are allowed.
2. Claims 8, 13, 15, 21, and 26 have been canceled.

**REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE**

3. The following is an Examiner's statement for reasons for allowance:

The closest prior art *Michael J. Bender & Slobodan P. Simonovic*, (hereinafter "*Becker et al.*") "A System Approach for Collaborative Decision Support in Water Resources Planning" IEEE, 1996, and *Steve Glickman*, "Interpreting Business Assessment Results" June 8, 1998, does not teach or render obvious applicant's claimed invention.

4. Specifically, a computer-implemented method which may be utilized for implementing the four steps (framing, alternatives, analysis, connection) proposed in the Dialogue Decision Process (DDP), in different environments in a universal manner.

5. With regards to claim 1, *Bender et al.* & *Glickman*, does not disclose "...step (k) wherein an application interface provides an interface between the application and the collaborative

*decision platform, where step (b) retrieving information front a database in accordance with the decision logic; step (c) receiving information from a user in accordance with the decision logic utilizing a user interface; and step (d) processing the information utilizing the decision logic; are carried out using universal modules capable of interfacing with different applications adapted for applying the universal modules to different business sectors ... .”*

6. With regards to claim 14, *Bender et al. & Glickman*, does not disclose “ ... *step (k) wherein an application interface provides an interface between the application and the collaborative decision platform, where computer code segments of step (b) computer code for retrieving information from a database in accordance with the decision logic; step (c) computer code for receiving information from a user in accordance with the decision logic utilizing a user interface; and step (d) computer code for processing the information utilizing the decision logic; are carried out using universal modules capable of interfacing with different applications adapted for applying the universal modules to different business sectors ... .”*

7. With regards to claim 27, *Bender et al. & Glickman*, does not disclose “ ... *step (k) wherein an application interface provides an interface between the application and the collaborative decision platform. where logic elements of step (b) logic for retrieving information from a database in accordance with the decision logic; step (c) logic for receiving information from a user in accordance with the decision logic utilizing a user interface; and step (d) logic for processing the information utilizing the decision logic; are carried out using universal modules capable of interfacing with different applications adapted for applying the universal modules to different business sectors; wherein the collaborative decision platform communicates with the application through a standard interface protocol ....”*

Art Unit: 2121

## Correspondence Information

8. Any inquires concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Michael B. Holmes** who may be reached via telephone at **(703) 308-6280**. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday between 8:00 A.M. and 5:00 P.M. est. If you need to contact the Examiner, regarding After Final concerns, please send it to **(703) 746-7238**. If you need to send an Official facsimile transmission, please send it to **(703) 746-7240**. If you need to send a Non-Official or Draft facsimile transmission, please send it to **(703) 746-7239**.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the **Examiner's Supervisor, Anthony Knight**, may be reached at **(703) 308-3179**.

Any response to this office action should be mailed too:  
**Director of Patents and Trademarks Washington, D.C. 20231**, or **Hand-delivered** responses should be delivered to the **Receptionist, located on the fourth floor of Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive Arlington, Virginia**.

**Michael B. Holmes**  
Patent Examiner  
Artificial Intelligence  
Art Unit 2121  
United States Department of Commerce  
Patent & Trademark Office

  
**Anthony Knight**  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Group 3600